

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10-13 have been cancelled.

New claims 14-23 have been added. Support for new claims 14-23 can be found at page 17, lines 3-14 of the specification, and FIG. 10. Claims 14-23 are currently pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 5-8 UNDER § 101:

Claims 5-8 have been cancelled. Therefore, the objection of claims 5-8 is now moot.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-8 AND 10-13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER ROBERTSON ET AL. (US PATENT NO. 6,594,799; HEREAFTER “ROBERTSON”)(previously cited) IN VIEW OF VAN HUBEN ET AL. (US PATENT NO. 5,950,201; HEREAFTER “VAN HUBEN”)(previously cited):

As mentioned above, claims 1-8 and 10-13 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-13 is now moot.

III. NEW CLAIMS 14-23:

Neither Robertson nor Van Huben disclose a “noise countermeasure information determining means for executing one of the noise countermeasure processes selected by the user from said noise countermeasure list information, according to the items which is required for the noise countermeasure, and transmitting a noise countermeasure information which is determined as a result of the execution of the one of the noise countermeasure processes selected, to said user terminal,” as recited in new claim 14, for example.

At page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Robertson does not teach tools and services including noise countermeasure information. However, the Examiner asserts that Van Huben discloses this feature at column 17, lines 58-64.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Van Huben discloses a computerized design control system (DCS) for designing integrated circuits. The DCS tracks components of a model (i.e. simulation, timing, noise analysis, etc.) (see column 6, lines 37-38 and column 17, lines 58-64). That is, Van Huben merely mentions that the DCS tracks components of a model including “noise analysis”. Neither Robertson nor Van Huben disclose “noise countermeasure information” or “a plurality of noise countermeasure processes” as recited in the present

invention. Therefore, the teachings of Robertson and Van Huben are fundamentally different from that of the present invention.

That is, unlike the present invention, the combination of Robertson and Van Huben fails to disclose the advantage of a user being able to select a noise countermeasure process from a plurality of noise countermeasure processes.

VI. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

August 9, 2005

By:


Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501